## REMARKS

The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the outstanding Action. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 14 have been amended to further set forth the application. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are now pending and therefore submitted for consideration.

The Amendment is necessary and not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested, and it is proper under 35 C.F.R. § 1.116 since the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the Amendment amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) does not present any additional claims; and (d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary.

Section 102 Rejection

**Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Salm et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,396, hereinafter "Salm").**

The reasons for this rejection are substantially the same as those set forth in the previous Office Action dated October 24, 2002, except for a new ground of rejection with respect to a previously added limitation to claim 1.

Claim 1 has been further amended to more specifically point out distinguishing features of the instant application over *Salm*. Particularly, it is noted that in *Salm*, when the same key is actuated again (step 10), the process of reading and displaying a list of characters in a group corresponding to the actuation of the same key is repeated (6: 7-16). By contrast, the claimed invention now specifically set forth that when the same numeric key is pressed again in the instant application, the searching means cease to repeat the process of searching for a list of names to include a character assigned to the pressed numeric key. Instead, the searching means performs a different search, i.e., for a list of names that include a group classification assigned to the pressed numeric key.

Section 103 Rejections

**Claims 2-6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Salm* in view of <u>Cushman et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,125,287, hereinafter "*Cushman*").**

The reasons for this rejection are the same as those set forth in the previous Office Action dated October 24, 2002. In maintaining this rejection, item 9 of the outstanding Action asserted that the distinctions with respect to the two long presses have not been clearly set forth in claim 4.

It is respectfully submitted that the above-discussed amendments to claim 1 from which claims 2-4 directly or indirectly depend are sufficient to overcome this rejection. Particularly, *Cushman* does not supplement for the above-discussed deficiency in *Salm*

on performing a different search function when the same key is subsequently pressed again.

Moreover, claim 4 indirectly depends from claim 1 and recites searching means, which is characterized by searching the storage unit, when a numeric key on the operating unit is pressed for at least a predetermined time, for names that include a character assigned to the pressed numeric key. Specifically, when the operating unit receives a second key press of the same key for at least the predetermined time, the searching means finds names having a group classification assigned to the pressed numeric key.

Whereas, a specific portion of *Cushman* cited by the outstanding Action (i.e., col. 3, lines 56-60) merely discloses that frequently called numbers (first directory) are reserved for memory locations 1-8, and a main directory (second directory) is reserved for other memory locations 10-99. Additionally, *Cushman* discloses that the telephone numbers are classified into at least two groups, and that the index numbers 1 and 2 are respectively assigned to "the frequently called numbers" and to "the main directory" (see Fig. 2a).

As such, *Cushman* merely relates to a storage unit that further stores group classifications corresponding to the names, and that each group classification is assigned to one of the numeric keys. There is simply no disclosure therein suggesting that when the operating unit receives a second key press of the same key for at least the predetermined time, the searching means finds names having a group classification assigned to the pressed numeric key.

As to **Salm**, step 10 as discussed in column 7, lines 19-24 of the specification and shown in Fig. 2 involves a "holding cursor" when the same key is actuated after a short deactivation period (see Fig. 1). However, there is no disclosure in **Salm** that suggests a second key press of the same key for at least the predetermined time. **Salm** also discloses that if there is no entry matching a particular character string, then the next closest matching data entry may be displayed (2: 57-64), and that during the cursor controlled selection of a character string, time-out control (not shown in FIG. 1) may be performed (6: 24-33). However, such disclosure simply lacks any description on the searching means finding names having a group classification assigned to the pressed numeric key.

Accordingly, the same key actuation in **Salm** merely relates to cursor controlled selection of character string. Additionally, neither **Salm** nor **Cushman**, whether individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every feature as set forth in claim 4, such as:

"when a numeric key is pressed for at least a predetermined time, the searching means conducts search based on a character assigned to the pressed numeric key" and

"when a second key press of the same key is received for at least the predetermined time, the searching means conducts search based on a group classification assigned to the pressed numeric key".

**Claims 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16 and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Salm* in view of *Cushman* and further in view of <u>Lee et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 4,475,013, hereinafter "*Lee*").**

The reasons for this rejection are the same as those set forth in the previous Office Action dated October 24, 2002, except for a new ground of rejection with respect to the previously added limitation to claim 14.

Regarding claims 7-9, 11 and 12, it is respectfully submitted that the above-discussed amendments to claim 1 from which claims 7-9, 11 and 12 directly or indirectly depend are sufficient to overcome this rejection since neither *Cushman* nor *Lee* supplements for the above-discussed deficiency in *Salm* on performing a different search function when the same key is subsequently pressed again.

As to claim 14 from which claims 15, 16 and 20 directly or indirectly depend, claim 14 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 as to include further distinguishing features of the instant application over *Salm*, *Cushman* and *Lee*.

**Claims 13, 19 and 21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Salm* in view of *Cushman*, further in view of *Lee*, and further in view of <u>Landry et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,602, hereinafter "*Landry*").**

The reasons for this rejection are substantially the same as those set forth in the previous Office Action dated October 24, 2002.

It is respectfully submitted that the above-discussed amendments to claims 1 and 14 from which claims 13, 19 and 21 directly or indirectly depend are sufficient to

14

overcome this rejection since neither *Lee* nor *Landry* supplements for the above-discussed deficiency in *Salm* on performing a different search function when the same key is subsequently pressed again.

**Claims 10, 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Salm* in view of *Cushman*, further in view of *Lee*, and further in view of Helin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,439, hereinafter "*Helin*").**

The reasons for this rejection are substantially the same as those set forth in the previous Office Action dated October 24, 2002.

It is respectfully submitted that the above-discussed amendments to claims 1 and 14 from which claims 10, 17 and 18 directly or indirectly depend are sufficient to overcome this rejection since none of *Cushman*, *Lee* and *Helin* supplements for the above-discussed deficiency in *Salm* on performing a different search function when the same key is subsequently pressed again.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-21 recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicants submit that this subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claimed invention novel and unobvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants therefore request that each of claims 1-21 be found allowable, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to

arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an

appropriate extension of time.   Any fees for such an extension together with any

additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn, PLLC

Raymond J. Ho        *Reg. No. 41,668*
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,838

**Customer No.:  004372**
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C.  20036-5339
Tel:  (202) 857-6000
Fax:  (202) 638-4810

RJH:elz::klf

TECH/223181.1